

E. H. Bockhoff: 25 Years of Bolshevik World Aggression The first foreign policy terrorist act of the Soviet government was Trotsky's "Appeal to All Working People of Europe" on November 6, 1917. This was followed by the cancellation of the foreign loans and debts of the tsarist government by the decree of January 23, 1918, explicitly invoking the proletarian right of world revolution, and not invoking a state of emergency under international law. The Allied and Associated Powers responded at that time by not recognizing the Soviet government and by openly supporting the White Guard anti-Bolshevik defenses. We know that Red imperialism collapsed before Warsaw in 1920. Since then, however, the Soviets were forced to prepare for new imperialist deeds on their own territory. Germany was the next object of murder of communism. It was not to be conquered by wars of conquest, but from within, by organized civil war, taking advantage of its political mood of despair. Thus Stalin wrote already in 1924 in a personal letter to the German communist Thalheimer: "The coming revolution in Germany is the most important world event of our days. The victory of the revolution in Germany will have a greater significance for the proletariat in Europe and the USA than the victory of the Russian revolution six years ago. The victory of the German proletariat will undoubtedly move the center of the world revolution from Moscow to Berlin." This revolutionization of Germany was completed in 1932. The gate to Europe was to be broken down. But at the last moment Moscow suffered its decisive European defeat in Germany. Thus, for the second time, Europe was saved from red imperialism. Immediately Moscow tried to make up for the defeat with increased force. In 1935 it was Spain's turn. However, on the eve of the intended red revolt, national Spain rose up and surprisingly preempted Moscow's conquest overnight. But this was the third time that Moscow's incursion into Europe – from the southwest – was repelled. Already in 1920 the revolutionary hopes of victory, which found their concise expression in the preamble of the constitution of the RSFSR of 1918, where the imminent outbreak of the world revolution was triumphantly proclaimed, had been shattered. In a speech on November 27, 1920, Lenin characterized the policy of the Soviets as exploiting the contradictions among the imperialists in such a way that ultimately socialism would win. Moscow has pursued this tactic to this day. The period from 1920 to 1923 is characterized by the conclusion of border pacification treaties with the Baltic and Asian states. Moscow needed peace. However, this did not prevent Moscow from continuing its domestic imperialism with its preliminary tactical distance from foreign policy imperialism and from proceeding against the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union, such as Ukraine, Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia, in violation of international law, in order to fully annex them. In 1917 Ukraine won its political autonomy. Then it was occupied by Moscow. The Turko-Armenian republics were also deprived of their independence by Moscow in 1922, although they were recognized by most states, partly de jure, partly de facto. They were the states of Azerbaijan, Armenia and Georgia. Moscow itself had recognized the independence of Georgia, for example, by a treaty of May 7, 1920, which fact did not prevent Moscow from annexing the country as early as February 1921 without a declaration of war. The League of Nations also noted the flagrant breach of international law in a resolution in 1922, and again in 1924, but without success. And in 1934 the same League of Nations, on the occasion of the admission of the Soviet Union to the Geneva Caucus, refused to respect its own resolutions, sparing the Soviets even the path of the admission procedure provided for in Article 1 of the Constitution. The same happened to the republics of Bukhara and Khiva, whose independence Moscow had guaranteed in Article 8 of the Treaty of Afghanistan, but which were also annexed on 18 November 1924. On 20.9.1935 the legitimate representatives of Azerbaijan, Georgia, Turkey and Ukraine living abroad submitted to the League of Nations a protest letter against the Soviet policy of oppression against the non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union, but without success. Let us also remember the national freedom struggle of the Volga-Tatars, the Crimean-Turks, the Belorussians, the Karelians and the Ingermans, who for 25 years have been subjected to a bloody

terrorism, systematically exterminated and deported. Before the eyes of the whole world, Moscow has successively annexed five independent, internationally recognized states, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Armenia, the North Caucasus and Ukraine – not to mention the imperialist penetration of the vast territory of outer Mongolia, where cavalry regiments are stationed, red airfields have been established and red commissars direct politics. Time and again, the nationalities have given vent to their desire for freedom, for example in Georgia in 1924, where the Soviets smothered the rebellion of the masses in a sea of blood. Nevertheless, their will for freedom has not been extinguished. Moscow always tells us on all international occasions that it is the true representative of the "right of nationalities". But we know that only the Finns, Poles, Latvians, Estonians and Lithuanians were able to save themselves from the Red terror at that time, while all the others succumbed to it. Communists who had emigrated, criminals with criminal records who had fled, Gypsies, etc. represented the leading class of Germans in the Soviet Union. For nowhere should there be close contact between the leadership and the masses. The leaders should be completely free from national sympathies and antipathies in the implementation of the terror measures. Villages were half evacuated in order to fill them up with foreigners and to destroy closed people's settlements. Tens of thousands were sent from Karelia and Ingermanland to Siberia. Nevertheless, Article 17 of the "Soviet Constitution" hypocritically speaks of a so-called "free right of re-exit" of the federal republics from the "Soviet Union", although every attempt of realization is immediately bloodily put down as "counter-revolutionary banditry". The Soviet Union was particularly fond of including so-called "non-interference clauses" in the so-called "border pacification treaties," as in the treaty of the USSR, with Poland in Article 5, in which the two powers undertake "to respect the political sovereignty of the other part, not to interfere in each other's internal affairs." Nor, as it states, should such aims be supported. With contemptible generosity the Soviet Government has entered into these "obligations" with many states, only to organize systematically at the same moment the violation of these obligations by the Comintern. It is a mockery of the honesty of legal good faith that the Moscow Comintern government hypocritically pledges itself at every opportunity not only to "non-aggression in foreign policy" but, as in these clauses, even to "non-aggression in domestic policy", only to violate them again immediately. For 25 years, however, the deceived states did not believe in the identity of the Comintern and the Soviet government and gave in to the illusion that such clauses would after all dissuade Moscow from joining the Comintern. Thus the entire diplomatic intercourse of all the states of the world with the Soviet government had to become a single disappointment of their good will and faith, a continuous chain of failures based on the fundamental misunderstanding of the revolutionary character of Soviet policy, a constant attempt, accompanied by these daily failures and disappointments, to "dissuade" Moscow from Bolshevism and to make the Soviet republic adopt a "national policy". On the other hand, however, the entire 25-year Soviet diplomacy is nothing else than the criminal attempt to lead the same states by the nose with the pretense that not it, but only the allegedly non-subordinate "international communism" is the bearer of the world revolution, with its Janus-faced method and to deceive the states about their own true revolutionary objectives with a legal hypocrisy unprecedented in the history of international law. The states even concluded "friendship pacts" with Moscow. The treaties with Germany, England, Italy, Norway and Austria then contained, among other things, so-called "propaganda prohibitions". Part A of the Soviet-English agreement of 1921 literally states: "Each party shall refrain from hostile acts or measures against the other party, as well as from carrying on any official propaganda, direct or indirect, against the existence of the British Empire or the Russian Soviet Republic outside its territory. Russian Soviet Republic outside its own borders, but in particular it is agreed that the Russian Soviet Government will refrain from any attempt, military, diplomatic or otherwise, to incite any people to any action in any way detrimental to the interests of Great Britain or the British Empire ..." But as early as Sept. 7, 1921, England was

complaining about revolutionary talk at the Comintern Congress in Moscow. Litvinov, Deputy Foreign Commissar, lied then – just as he does today – that "the Soviet government had nothing to do with the Comintern." Despite all this, diplomatic relations between the powers of the Soviet Union became closer and closer. In 1924, 1925 England, Italy, Norway, Austria, Denmark, France, Japan and Sweden recognized the Soviet government. In 1933, America recognized the Soviet Union, while Switzerland and Holland refused recognition in 1935 and 1936, respectively. Likewise, Portugal could not be persuaded to do so by foreign policy pressure. Germany, of all countries, was the first to recognize the Soviet Union in the Rapallo Treaty of 1922. Germany was then abused by Rathenau to break the boycott belt against Moscow. The Soviets promptly reaped the success. For the series of de jure recognitions followed. The second period, from 1925 to 1931, was marked by the conclusion of the non-aggression and neutrality treaties. In 1926, the Berlin Treaty was concluded between Germany and the Soviet Union, which fleshed out the Rapallo policy and in which the government of the day undertook to ensure that, after its entry into the League of Nations, the latter "would not pursue a policy hostile to the Soviet Union." Thus Germany was advanced by Moscow as a buffer. As is well known, all international questions were fought out on Germany's back. The years 1925 to 1927 saw the Soviet Union's "non-aggression treaties" with Turkey, Afghanistan and Persia, as well as negotiations with the Baltic states and Lithuania. Moscow wanted to create evacuated zones on its borders. In 1926 it proposed to Lithuania, Finland, Estonia and Latvia the conclusion of bilateral non-aggression pacts. At that time, Moscow was the eager advocate of such bilateral agreements, which, as is well known, were later offered again and again by National Socialist Germany. Now, however, the same Moscow suddenly described such bilateral agreements as the "nucleus of future wars", whereas it used to praise them as a "means of guaranteeing peace". For this, Moscow offered the "collectivity thesis" and the ideal of a system of confusing automatically functioning giant pact networks, which were also earlier condemned by Moscow as the nucleus of wars, but then passionately affirmed. The tactics of Soviet diplomacy are baseless. It is significant that the intended agreement between Latvia, Estonia and Finland, on the one hand, and Moscow, on the other, did not come about, since Moscow suddenly refused to formulate appropriate propaganda waiver clauses in agreement with its partners. Lithuania alone, however, concluded a treaty with Moscow in 1926, which states, among other things, with the same dishonest pathos that we find in all Soviet "treaties":

"Unalterably animated by the desire to see the Lithuanian people independent like any other people, about which the Government of the Soviet Union has repeatedly expressed itself in its rallies . . . etc. etc." Here again is classically shown the fundamental illusion with which the states for years believed the thousand times disproved promises of the Soviets, by which they only sanctioned their national suicide under international law. Let us now follow the British-Soviet relationship since the recognition of the year 1924. In 1924, a treaty was formulated on the debt question and the claims for compensation of British subjects against the Soviet government. This treaty also included the dubious Moscow "non-interference clauses" and "propaganda waivers." As a result of a sensational incident, however, the British government declared as early as November 21, 1924, that it "no longer sees itself in a position to submit the said treaty to the House of Commons for consideration, nor to submit it to His Majesty for ratification. What had happened? The British secret police had discovered a letter from Si- novyev- Apfelbaum containing instructions from the Comintern to the English Communist Party for the purpose of organizing the Communist revolution, particularly the decomposition of the navy and army. In response to the ideas of the Foreign Office, Moscow had the temerity to flatly deny the authenticity of this letter. England then rightly declared that it would be fruitless to enter into a treaty with the Soviet Union whose essential content would be systematically violated by it even before ratification. There was still no break in diplomatic relations, but the Anglo-Soviet relationship cooled more and

more. The Soviets tried to revive it, but Chamberlain declared in the House of Commons on June 15, 1926 – and it is important to point this out today: "In every one of my conversations with Soviet representatives I have reminded them that Communist propaganda makes good relations with the Soviet Union impossible and that I would not give my consent to further negotiations on the debt question as long as this propaganda continued. Even at the present time I have reasons enough to break off all diplomatic relations with the Bolshevik government." In 1927, diplomatic relations were inevitably broken off after the investigation of the Bolshevik trading company "Arcos" again revealed incriminating material. At that time, the British government itself published a White Paper on the Comintern's stirring-up work in England! Nevertheless, relations were resumed in 1929. It was MacDonald under whose cabinet the trade treaty, later not ratified, was agreed in 1924. After his fall, a Conservative cabinet refused to ratify it. After his fall, it was again a Labor cabinet that resumed diplomatic relations in 1929 and then finally concluded the trade treaty agreed in 1924. In this new treaty, too, the Soviet government once again gave a high and holy assurance of its renunciation of propaganda, knowing full well that it would wash its hands of any Comintern action with the same hypocrisy with which it has always denied its identity with the international revolutionaries of the Comintern. "... to live together in peace and friendship, to respect most solemnly the undoubted right of a State, within its own jurisdiction, to order its own life in its own way, to restrain all persons and organizations under its direct and indirect control – including the organization receiving any financial assistance from them – from any overt or clandestine act, intended in any way to endanger the peace or welfare of any part or territory of the British Empire or the USSR, or to embitter the relations of the British Empire or the USSR with their neighbors or any other countries. We see what pains in legal formulation the states have taken to oblige Moscow to non-interference. But we also see what abysmal hypocrisy and insincerity are involved when Moscow indiscriminately signs such "commitments" in order nevertheless to call day after day in its press on the workers of all countries to world revolution. ♦ Since 1932 the attempts of the Soviets to link their so-called security system, which always pursues only the safeguarding of their intended aggressive domestic and foreign imperialism, with the European continental system of French security policy date back to 1932. We want to state here that this meant a complete reversal of Soviet foreign policy and a shift of Rapallo policy from Germany to France. What were the reasons for this? Moscow saw the victorious advance of the National Socialist revolution in Germany and made provisions for the eventuality that Communism would receive an unexpected defeat, in order to immediately take the anti-Bolshevik Germany, which had escaped from Moscow's tentacles, once again in its pincers from the outside, after it had freed itself internally from Moscow's red pincers, which had also been a fact of foreign policy since Rapallo. To this end, Moscow had to suddenly and radically overturn its entire foreign policy and the Comintern's entire arsenal of slogans. Now Versailles had to be defended and even the League of Nations orthodoxy not only endorsed but passionately advocated. The whole tactic was changed. More than before, Moscow had to strive to smuggle itself into the European society of states as a "presentable entity" and to advertise itself as an alleged "democracy" in order to be able to defame all anti-Bolshevik forces as "fascist" on the other side. The democracies had to be organized for this purpose as a so-called "anti-fascist front", but in fact as a front abused by Moscow against the national-socialist forces of the world. Unfortunately, Moscow had succeeded in this to a large extent! Its former opponents now became its confederates. Moscow succeeded in disguising itself outwardly as liberal-democratic, and thus that terrible mental confusion about the nature and aims of Bolshevism arose. Immediately, outwardly, the GPU. "formally abolished," only to promptly reappear as a "department of the Commissariat of the Interior." The entry of the Soviet Union into the League of Nations was zealously pursued, by the same states that had earlier opposed it. Litvinov then made his triumphal entrance into Geneva in 1934 with a speech that

must have brought a blush of indignation to the face of every connoisseur of Soviet policy. From then on, the League of Nations swam in Moscow's wake. Then, as we know, in the course of this "liberal" camouflage and deception tactic, after months of propaganda drumfire all over the world, the new "Constitution" was enacted, that most gigantic legal work of fraud known to legal history in its thousand-year past, which has no equal. We remember that in 1927 the Soviet ambassador Rakovsky made a declaration in Moscow, by which the soldiers of all armies of the world were publicly called upon to join the ranks of the Red Army. Outraged at the time, the French press spoke of "Moscow's interference in internal French affairs." In 1933, after Moscow's defeat in Germany, France became more and more inclined to join forces with the Soviet Union because it did not believe in the identity of the Soviet government and the Comintern. The supporters of the Popular Front knew all the more about this, but the fact could not be unknown to their leaders either. Moscow saw the good opportunity to perfume its blood-soaked executioner regime with the old "primacy" of the French civilization thesis. Since then, Moscow invokes "civilization" with stressed pathos and recommends itself as the defender of European culture and progressive humanity. Whoever is against

Moscow is against civilization! What confusion of the fronts! The mortal enemy of the peoples had succeeded in presenting himself as a "friend" to the doomed mankind in the mask of the Biedermann. At the same time, in 1932, Moscow assured itself of the neutrality of the Baltic states, whose fear of being crushed by the red colossus was quite understandable. In 1932, after the conclusion of non-aggression pacts with the Baltic states, a corresponding arrangement was made with Poland, which was extended in 1934 until 1945. Strangely enough, Moscow had always refused to conclude such a non-aggression pact with Germany as well, although the Führer had repeatedly offered such a treaty to the Soviet Union since 1933. So Moscow did not want to enter into a non-aggression pact with Germany. Instead, Germany concluded the well-known non-aggression pact with Poland. But Litvinov was extremely angry about this. He, the zealous defender of bilateral pacts, as far as they are made by Moscow, suddenly declared in the 15th Assembly of the League of Nations in September 1935, to the great astonishment of the world, that the German-Polish non-aggression pact meant the "nucleus of future wars". This red Janus-head was incalculable in its ruthlessness. Moscow painfully felt the defeat by Germany in 1933. This is understandable. Its greatest hopes were disappointed. Still on 23.12.1931 "Pravda" wrote triumphantly: "The KPD. takes the responsible post in the international workers' movement." On 10.5.1935, however, the same "Pravda" wrote: "Russia has end-validly abandoned its earlier ... anti-Versailles attitude ..." Germany had no interest at all in a Franco-Soviet antagonism, but all the more an existential interest in the non-occurrence of the Bolshevik encirclement; for it needed peace and quiet for internal reconstruction. But the transition from Rapallo to the Soviet-French policy of interests became a fact. It was one of the direct consequences of Moscow's defeat in Germany, for every Bolshevik encirclement leads not only to the threat of a single country, but inevitably to the threat of all other neighboring states to which Bolshevism has moved closer. ♦ Since the changeover, the Soviets' efforts to impose their definition of the aggressor on the world also date. Litvinov immediately appropriated the familiar security thesis:

"first security, then disarmament," and Politis's report, which was submitted to the 1933 disarmament conference, was based on Litvinov-Finkelstein's proposals. Then, on July 3, 1933, an agreement was reached in London between Moscow, Persia, Turkey, Poland, Latvia, Estonia, and Afghanistan, as well as the states of the Little Entente, on the determination of the aggressor. Thus, these were mostly the neighboring states of the Soviet Union. These conventions were a supplement to the non-aggression pacts concluded with the same states. According to the Soviet view, the aggressor was anyone who "crosses foreign territory with armed force". At first glance, this definition seemed to be very logical, but it had a fundamental catch. It does not distinguish in any way between a provocative attack and the

defense against such a provocative attack. According to it, therefore, even an act done in self-defense, for instance in response to the permanent Soviet attack, may appear to be an unlawful "attack" despite its permissibility in the context of self-help under international law. The purpose of this definition becomes clear: the Soviet government has at its disposal the international proletarian instrument of power of the Comintern, to which the Red Army can then be made available at will in the event of war, using all cover. This Soviet definition takes into account the desire of red imperialism to keep its territory free in any case and under any circumstances, in order to be able to wage the international class war from this secured basis with international revolutionary means, which other, normally existing states do not have. Thus, Moscow wants to keep at bay "positively legally" only those states to which it itself has planned the next murder, but nevertheless wants to stamp as aggressors every state which may be forced to defend itself against red imperialism. Moreover, Moscow, as a member of the League of Nations, tried to mobilize for itself the entire League of Nations statute and its sanctions machine. Moscow tried to do this in the agreement on the Dardanelles in Montreux in 1936 and also in the French-Soviet alliance pact and practically achieved it to a large extent. In the event that Moscow should attempt to carry the red torch through Europe, the League of Nations was to be misused in order to stifle by sanctions the power of resistance of all those who in such a case defended their national sovereignty against the Bolshevik desire for conquest. According to the Soviet view, the illegal actions on the basis of the Bolshevik encirclement pacts were also regarded as obligations of the League of Nations. But how the Soviets actually think about "attack" and "defense" outside their legal mirror-image fencing, the military theorist Degtjarew said quite openly: "The proletarian state always wages a defensive war, regardless of who attacked first, who attacked first, and at the same time every war that the League of Councils will wage will be a defensive war and just, regardless of who started it first." This only confirms the above statements. And military theorist Gusev says: "We can be forced to attack strategy. Also, we can be involved in a revolutionary war of aggression in connection with the revolutionary upheaval somewhere in the West. Finally, the case is not excluded that we will be forced to start a revolutionary war with the aim of the fastest unleashing of the revolution in the West. In this case our strategy will have to bear a strictly attacking character." Lenin also confirms this view when he says; "We have also now absolutely the duty to prepare the revolutionary war ... The question whether a revolutionary war can now be waged without delay must be decided exclusively from the point of view of whether the material conditions for the realization of such an intention exist and are in the interests of the socialist revolution, which has already begun." So we see where we are headed when communist world conquerors are allowed to put themselves on an equal footing with the national freedom fighters of Europe under international law. It is remarkable that in 1924 Chicherin in a letter to the Secretary General of the League of Nations denied the possibility of determining the aggressor at all. Today, however, when Bolshevism has become respectable and has succeeded in deceiving the world to a large extent about its true intentions, even mobilizing world politics for itself, such a definition is harmless, not for the peoples themselves, but precisely for Moscow interventionism. After the method of "stop the thief" it is possible to hide in the shadow of the great democracies, but nevertheless at the decisive moment to drop the mask of "democracy" with the old and unchanged brutality and to turn out the bloody face of terror. After the London Conventions and the rapprochement with France, the corresponding rapprochement with the Little Entente took place, especially with Czechoslovakia and Romania. It is significant that whenever the Soviets go out for spoils, they are generous in giving sacred "commitments" on "non-interference" and "defensive" in order to reassure the peoples. On 9.6.1934, for example, Litvinov-Finkelstein writes to Titulescu "to guarantee full respect for mutual sovereignty and abstention from any direct and indirect interference in the internal affairs and development of the other state, in particular abstention from any agitation, propaganda and any kind of intervention, as well as

support for them." ♦ In this framework, it is now also interesting and significant to examine the history of U.S.-Soviet relations. Until 1933, America had refused to recognize Moscow. In 1933, however, Roosevelt, out of economic interest, believed that he had to establish relations with Moscow. In this case it becomes quite clear how fine psychologists the leaders of communism are when they cynically declare in the "Program of the Comintern": "The capitalist states, in spite of the importance of the Soviet market for them, are constantly wavering between their commercial interests and the fear of the strengthening of the Soviet Union, which at the same time means the growth of the world revolution." (Page 68.) Indeed, so it is. The Soviets speculated quite correctly on the economic interests to which, unfortunately, national existence is too often sacrificed. As late as 1931, the head of the legal department of the State Department, Hockworth, had declared: "The Soviet Russian Government has failed to meet the basic requirements for the maintenance of international relations, for it affords neither the person nor the property of foreigners the degree of respect and protection required by international law, it does not recognize the international financial obligations of the governments that preceded it, and it disregards the right of other nations to develop their institutions and to regulate their internal affairs without interference from rarely foreign states." Nevertheless, on 16.11.1933 the recognition was carried out by exchange of notes. In this again the diplomatic deception tactics of the Soviets are revealed, in the non-intervention note it is stated: "Embarrassingly respecting the indisputable right of the other Contracting Party to order its own life within its own borders and its own jurisdiction and to refrain from interference in any way in the internal affairs of the other Contracting Party." Sections 3 and 4 deal with the prohibition: "... To permit the activity of

such organizations as aim at the violent overthrow of the political and social order in the territory of the other Contracting Party." The exchange of notes on the question of religious practice, which had been the main obstacle to recognition in the eyes of the American public, is downright outrageous. Finkelstein dared to claim at that time that the Soviet Union granted everyone the right of "free exercise of religion". But is it necessary here to cite the declaration of the Soviet leaders proclaiming the eradication of all religion as "opium for the people"? Admittedly, Article 124 also of the new "Constitution" proclaims the so-called "freedom to practice religious cults". But this so-called "right" is immediately invalidated by the following sentence, which proclaims the "freedom of anti-religious propaganda", and, what is not uninteresting, explicitly in the name of the "freedom of knowledge". Of course, the consequences of this deception could not be ignored. But now more than ever, Moscow, having found in the Soviet Embassy in Washington its diplomatic representation endowed with extraterritoriality, worked to revolutionize America. put that she was not in a position to put the promise into practice. Her authority within her national territory is unlimited, and her power to supervise the acts and utterances of organizations and individuals within her borders is unlimited." The British government also protested in Moscow as late as Aug. 19, 1935, because of Dimitroff's speech at the Comintern Congress; likewise Italy protested on Aug. 26, 1935 ♦ But what was the purpose of the Soviet Union's entry into the League of Nations in 1934? The intention was clear: the Second and Third Internationals and the Red Army were to be made serviceable to the League of Nations mechanism. As late as January 1933, Molotov had declared that the Soviet Union did not expect anything from the League of Nations, and as late as 5.12.1933, Litvinov declared in Rome that the entry of the Soviet Union was not topical. On 25.12.1933, however, Stalin already indicated the change of opinion in an interview. Thus, three days later, on 28.12., Molotov suddenly spoke publicly of the "braking role of the League of Nations with regard to forces that stand for war".

The following day also Finkelstein declared that the Soviet Union was "not willing to forego the exploitation of international national organizations for its aims". On May 28, 1934, "Pravda" announced the Pravda" and "Izvestia" then openly announced the entry. On the infamous telegram was

sent by thirty member states of the League of Nations to the member states to the Soviet government, in which the latter was called upon to enter in order to spare it the surely embarrassing examination of the conditions of admission. conditions, which up to then every admitted state had had to fulfill. had to fulfill. The telegram in question stated that the Soviet government may "dedicate its valuable cooperation" to the League of Nations. On 18.9.1934 Litvinov then made his triumphant entry and thus led the Moscow world revolutionary system with tails and top hats into the Geneva community of states. The same Litvinov, alias Finkelstein, Wal- lach, Meyer, Mietz, Pappascha, Graff, Polianski, was active before the in the international illegal arms trade before the revolution, and in 1908 he was in Paris during an attempt to steal the money Stalin had robbed during his bank robbery in Tiflis. Tbilisi, during which 32 people were killed and 250,000 rubles were looted, to safety, he was arrested. Since then Litvinov-Finkelstein was included in the French criminal list. In 1919, after being arrested, he was also expelled from England, In 1924 he was rejected by the English government as a Soviet ambassador, but this did not stop him from but this did not prevent him from meeting the English King, the cousin of the the English king, the cousin of the tsar murdered by his political friends. the cousin of the tsar murdered by his political friends, and later on behind the coffin of King George V. We still remember the case of Uruguay. In 1935 a communist uprising had broken out in communist uprising had broken out in Brazil, which had been financed by the in Montevideo. Investigations revealed that other uprisings were planned in Argentina and Uruguay. As a result, Uru- guay broke off diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union on Dec. 27, 1935. In the relevant note to the Soviet envoy Minkin, the fact- of the financing and the identity of Moscow with the Comintern was once again with the Comintern. Moscow promptly denied the facts again with its well-known lying method the facts again and was impudent enough to take this internal political Uruguay to the Council under Article 12 of the League of Nations Statutes. to the Council. Moscow even issued a trade ban against Uruguay. It is not without indignation that one reads Litvinov's speech of 23.1.1936 before the where he dared to call Uruguay's move "an act of an international conspiracy of fascism". international conspiracy of fascism against the Soviet Union". He said that the League of Nations had the duty "not to tolerate" Uruguay's "conduct contrary to international law" (!). Uruguay's "conduct in violation of international law", since its diplo- methods contradict the tasks of the League of Nations (!). Litvinov is thus evidently of the opinion that the defense of the Comin- terns and the punishment of all defensive measures taken against them by the states tasks of the League of Nations. The Council was anxiously anxious not to "offend" the Soviet Union, and was content to the challenge to the Soviet action, which was in fact only an insult to the League of the League of Nations itself and an attempt to abuse international law to legalize the right for the legalization of Wcltbolshevism, with the expression of "hope". The only way to settle the matter was to express the "hope" that both the Soviet Union and Uruguay would "resume their relations as soon as possible", "would like to resume their relations as soon as possible". In the meantime, in the course of the emphasized liberal-democratic tar- the Soviet Union, the ground for the French-Soviet unification pact of 2. of 2. 5.1935 had been paved. All earlier misgivings about Mos- kau had disappeared. The Soviet Union had, as it was believed, "abandoned the world revolution. abandoned the world revolution". The announcement of a new "constitution" proved cs etc. France celebrated the new pact and believed that by a Bolshevik encirclement of anti-Bolshevik Germany would better serve its security better than by initiating a sincere understanding repeatedly sincere understanding with the German neighbor, which the Fuehrer had neighbor. Shortly before ratification of the pact, the Führer once again implored France, in his famous interview with Bertrand de Jouvenel, not to associate with the with the devil, and extended his hand of friendship to the French people. and extended his hand of friendship to the French people. Then, however, the ominous event broke out. in the shadow of which the future of the European destiny in the next decade fate of Europe in the next decade. Bolshevism had



confused all fronts. Not only individuals, but all peoples will more and more pushed to a clear decision pro or contra. Behind the Comintern stood Moscow. For 25 years, the dispute raged over the responsibility of the Soviet government. In vain the world will wait that Moscow will "formally" take responsibility. The only to objectively establish the causal relationship between political cause and effect. This This statement is not only a political one, but also a factual one, Stalin is the factual master of the military and the legal master. Stalin is the factual ruler of the military, political and international proletari of the Soviet power. The world and the science of international law science must not allow itself to be deceived further about this. For Stalin has himself declared: "We have helped the Communist International and its sections to strengthen their influence in all countries. We have helped the Communist International and its sections to strengthen their influence in all countries of the world. We have done everything to develop and accelerate the international revolutionary movement. accelerate it." Pointing out these facts should be of interest to us and to the world at a moment when Stalin himself, that old strategist and tactician of the world revolution of the world revolution, is trying to reassure the highly alarmed public opinion of the world world opinion with the deceitful slogan that the Soviet Union is pursuing only defensive goals. defensive goals, while Germany and her allies are the world conquerors. are the world conquerors. He will not succeed in deceiving the world. For we know that today the world is engaged in a decisive war of self-defense against the 25-year world attack of Bolshevism. But whether we will ever get well again., this depends entirely on us, and it will certainly never again certainly never again any well-being will come to us if we do not provide it for ourselves: and in particular, if each individual among us does not among us does and acts in his own way, as if he were alone, and as if only alone, and as if the salvation of the future generations rested on him future generations rests on him alone. Johann Gottlieb Fichte, Speeches to the German Nation 1808.